



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
LONG RANGE PLANNING DIVISION**

**2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667
Phone (530) 621-4650, Fax (530) 642-0508**

December 2, 2014

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: David Defanti, Assistant Director

Subject: Public Outreach for Major Five-Year Capital Improvement Program and Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee updates

On September 30, 2014, the Board approved and authorized the Chair to sign Agreement for Services No. 214-S1511 with Kittelson and Associates, Inc. (KAI) to begin the Major Five-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program updates as required by General Plan Policy TC-Xb and Implementation Measures TC-A and TC-B. The Board approved this matter with the following changes:

- Reduced the project contingency to \$25,000
- Removed Item of Work 1.3 – Public Outreach from “Exhibit C Cost Proposal”
- Removed Flint Strategies as a sub consultant from “Exhibit C Cost Proposal”

The executed Agreement for Services No. 214-S1511, which includes these changes, is included as Attachment 6B. The Board also directed staff to return with a detailed plan for public outreach and a breakdown of Item of Work 1.3 into sub tasks (Shown as Task 5 in Attachment 6C).

Background

On November 3, 1998, voters passed the “Control Traffic Congestion Initiative” (Measure Y), which added five (5) policies to the General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element. The 2004 General Plan incorporates Measure Y (Policy TC-Xa) along with supplemental policies to implement Measure Y, including TC-Xb, TC-Xd, TC-Xe, TC-Xf, TC-Xg, TC-Xh, and TC-Xi. In November of 2008, voters passed an amendment to Measure Y and the Board adopted amendments to the supplemental policies. All County and private development projects must be consistent with Measure Y (Policy TC-Xa) and the supplemental policies.

General Plan Policy TC-Xb and Implementation Measures TC-A and TC-B ensure that potential development in the County does not exceed available roadway capacity. These General Plan policies require the County to prepare a CIP annually that specifies expenditures for roadway improvements within the next ten (10) years (the annual CIP Update). They also require the County to prepare a CIP at least every five (5) years

specifying expenditures for roadway improvements within the next twenty years (the Major Five-Year Update).

The TIM Fee Program is used to fund roadway improvements needed to accommodate growth anticipated over the next twenty years. Improvements funded by the TIM Fee Program include new roadways, roadway widenings, roadway intersection improvements and transit improvements. A TIM Fee program is legally required to meet guidelines as established by Assembly Bill 1600 (California Government Code Sections 66000-66008). The updated TIM Fee Program is a critical funding component of the CIP.

When the TIM Fee program was adopted by the Board in 2005 (Resolution 292-2005), it “set aside” sufficient funds to pay for the annual and Five-Year updates required by the General Plan. The TIM Fee components (TIM Fee Zone 1-7, TIM Fee Zone 8, and the Highway 50 TIM Fee fund) each contribute a “fair share” amount to fund these updates; the “fair share” that each TIM Fee Zone contributes is directly proportional to the total dollar amount of TIM Fee projects within that Zone (Attachment 6D, page 5). For instance, since approximately 37% of all TIM Fee dollars collected are planned to be spent in TIM Fee Zone 1-7, that Zone contributes 37% of the funding necessary to fund the updates required by the General Plan. The TIM Fee Program currently has approximately \$8,400,000 set aside for required updates.

Discussion

The Community Development Agency’s goal in development of the Major Five-Year CIP and TIM Fee updates is to actively seek the participation of all relevant agencies and stakeholders in the planning process. Involving the public early in the update process, asking for and making use of public input, and answering questions early and often can help address concerns in an appropriate and proactive manner. Public outreach and engagement can also build confidence in the update process and buy-in to the final products. It is critical that the County maintain a high level of transparency and cultivate relationships with the communities.

Staff will lead the public outreach effort. This effort would be enriched with consultant support. KAI and Flint Strategies have extensive experience in developing and delivering technical topics to the public relating to updates to fee programs. KAI and Flint Strategies, experienced in public outreach, would assist in establishing a strong relationship within local communities.

The benefit of having firms such as KAI and Flint Strategies assisting in public outreach is to support a County-wide outreach program by using real-time polling software/hardware and materials; interactive web-based tools that allow continuous input by the public; multi-media approaches including Newsletters, eBlasts, social media, and web-based surveys; and other methods such as community intercept interviews, media relations and traditional workshops to ensure that the outreach effort is effective. Additionally, having KAI and Flint Strategies available to assist with

the outreach program would allow staff more time to continue working on other Board priority projects, such as Missouri Flat Master Circulation & Financing Plan, Phase II, further involvement with review of traffic impact studies, and the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Four (4) Scenarios for augmenting agency and public outreach efforts are described in Attachment 6C, and summarized below and in Attachments 6E and 6F. Each Scenario represents varying degrees of outreach and consultant support. Scenario 1 meets the bare minimum needs of the project, while Scenario 4 is the most comprehensive option. The majority of the consultant time included in each of the Scenarios would involve creating data, graphics, and performing the appropriate research required to present relevant information to the Board, Planning Commission, the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC), and the public.

As shown in Attachment 6C, the Scenarios offer an increasing degree of assistance in outreach ranging from only basic graphical and process of data support to optimizing of web based tools. Should the Board choose one of the Scenarios summarized below, an amendment to Agreement for Services No. 214-S1511 will be processed to add an additional task (Task 5) that corresponds with the identified Scenario.

Scenario 1: Board and Public Agency Presentations/Workshops Only

Eight (8) presentations at the Board of Supervisors, one (1) presentation at the Planning Commission, and one (1) presentation at the EDCTC. All Presentations/Workshops will be extensively noticed via e-mails, public notices in local papers, website postings, etc.

Total - \$45,185

Scenario 2: Scenario 1 + Six (6) Additional Outreach meetings

County led Presentations/Workshops and up to six (6) public outreach meetings with KAI support as needed, including:

- One (1) public workshop at three (3) separate locations at the beginning of the update
- One (1) public workshop at three (3) separate locations prior to proposed adoption of updates

Total - \$77,540

Scenario 3: Scenario 2 + Limited Support by Flint Strategies

County led Presentations/Workshops and 6 public outreach meetings with expanded support by KAI and limited support by Flint Strategies.

Total - \$110,300

Scenario 4: Scenario 3 + Mini Roundtables + support by Flint Strategies

County/KAI led Presentations/Workshops, up to six (6) public outreach meetings and up to eight (8) Stakeholder Presentations/Mini-workshops and creation of interactive website development and web based tools with support by Flint Strategies.

Total - \$141,860

Attachment 6E includes the budget breakdown showing the cost of actual Board presentations, cost of development of materials, and the cost of public outreach. Attachment 6F includes the labor breakdown between County staff and KAI with and without Flint Strategies.

Recommendation

Community Development Agency, Long Range Planning, recommending the Board:

1. Identify Scenario 2 as the preferred public outreach Scenario for the Major Five-Year CIP and TIM Fee Program updates; and
2. Authorize the Chair to sign Amendment I to Agreement for Services No. 214-S1511 with KAI to provide public outreach support services for the Major Five-Year CIP and TIM Fee Program updates consistent with the Board's preferred Scenario, contingent upon review and approval of the Amendment by County Counsel and Risk Management.

Reason for Recommendation

Staff believes that Scenario 3 provides an appropriate amount and type of consultant assistance, as it includes Flint Strategies, who would provide technical information to the public in a more understandable and user-friendly manner. Most importantly, Flint Strategies has great success in using different approaches and methods of obtaining a greater amount of public input for traffic impact mitigation fee updates. Assistance by Flint Strategies would complement the standard County approach of sending e-mails to interested parties, posting notices on the County website and local papers.

However, based on Board feedback and direction to staff on September 30, 2014, staff is recommending the Board select Scenario 2. Scenario 2 provides for an adequate level of public outreach assistance from KAI to allow staff to focus primarily on project delivery. Scenario 2 will require more staff time than scenarios 3 and 4 in the preparation of materials and conducting outreach to ensure that the public has the opportunity to provide input.

If the Board determines that it wants only staff involved in the outreach with minimal consultant assistance, Scenario 1 would meet the minimum needs of the project. This Scenario would allow KAI to attend Board and Public Agency Presentations/Workshops and assist staff in preparing for these Presentations/Workshops.

If the Board decides not to choose any of the Scenarios provided, the County will not have consultant support in preparing for Board workshops and will not have consultant attendance at any Board hearings or presentations. The detriment to not having the consultant available at presentations is that the consultants do not have the opportunity to listen to the concerns of the Board and public first hand, and the County will not benefit from their expertise, availability to answer questions, or receive direct feedback from the Board during the workshops. The consultant will be conducting highly technical traffic analyses, economic/fiscal analyses, environmental review, and overall project management; therefore staff is confident that having these technical experts on hand for public agency presentation/workshops and public outreach meetings would be most beneficial to the overall success of this project as identified in Scenario 2.

Next steps

Upon Board direction, staff will prepare Amendment I to Agreement for Services No. 214-S1511 and route to County Counsel and Risk Management for review and approval.

Clerk of the Board Follow Up Actions

1. Upon approval by County Counsel and Risk Management, Clerk of the Board to obtain the Chair's signature on the two originals of Amendment I to Agreement for Services No. 214-S1511.
2. The Clerk of the Board to forward one fully-executed original to CDA Long Range Planning for further processing.

Contact

David Defanti, Assistant Director
CDA Long Range Planning

Concurrences:

Pending County Counsel and Risk Management approval.